

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-18, and 20-23 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. A full listing of pending claims is presented on pages 2-5 of this Reply.

With respect to the statement set forth in the Office Action dated July 14, 2008, indicating that an Appeal Brief was filed for the instant application, Applicants' representative respectfully notes that on June 13, 2008, an Appeal Brief *was not filed*, instead a Response to Final Office Action dated April 14, 2008, was filed on June 13, 2008.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

#### **I. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-11, 13-16, 22, and 23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-16, 22, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Card et al. (US 7,069,518) in view of Johnson et al. (US 2003/0132953) in further view of Fredlund et al. (US 2003/0128287) in further view of Raghunath (US 7,081,905). Applicants' representative respectfully request this rejection of the subject claims be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Applicants' claimed subject matter relates to systems and methods that facilitate previewing content of stacked or grouped information displays in an efficient manner. Dynamically-generated collections of documents or files can be represented as single icons or entities, and form part of the next generation file system user interfaces. Particular claimed novel aspects include the following.

***Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-15.***—Independent claim 1 (from which claims 3-11 and 13-15 depend) recites: *one or more controller inputs to control the presentation of the items, wherein a user utilizes the one or more controller inputs to navigate the collection of data items via selecting an item in the collection, **selection of the item changes the order of the collection and moves the selected item to the front of the collection** allowing the user to navigate the rest of the collection in a finer-grained manner starting at the selected item.* Card et al., Johnson et al., Fredlund et al., and Raghunath et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose expressly or inherently such novel claimed feature.

Card et al. relates to “[...] image display systems, and, in particular, user interfaces for the display and operation of large-scale informational sources, such as hypertext, three-dimensional books, databases, and other repositories of information.” (See col. 1:33-37; Card et al.) In addition, the primary reference discloses (col. 3:5-10): “The present invention comprises a system for displaying images of a virtual three-dimensional book having one or more virtual pages. The system comprises a display system capable of executing a display program. Images of the virtual three-dimensional book are produced on the display system.” Card et al. also discloses sliding-out virtual pages from a book (see col. 5, line 60-col. 6, line 6, and FIGs. 2A-2C; Card et al.). In particular the primary reference discloses (col. 5, line 60-col. 6, line 6): “[...] ‘sliding-out’ a virtual page only serves to display that virtual page in a different position on the computer display **separate from the visual representation of the rest of the virtual three-dimensional book**. In this way, “sliding-out” **does not denote the removal of data associated with a virtual page from its logical order** in the electronic representation of a virtual three-dimensional book. A “slide-out” page will still appear in the electronic representation of the virtual three-dimensional book despite the fact it may appear separately from the virtual three-dimensional book on the display. (Emphasis added.)” Moreover, Card et al. discloses implementation(s) of bookmarks (see, e.g., Abstract, col. 3:27-32, or col. 20, line 38-col. 21, line 2; and FIGs. 25-26; Card et al.), utilization of indicia to “provide content information” and select specific portions of large books (see, e.g., FIGs. 28-29 and col. 21:25-50; Card et al.) Yet, Card et al. fails to disclose expressly or inherently the limitation of [...] ***selection of the item changes the order of the collection and moves the selected item to the front of the collection allowing the user to navigate the rest of the collection in a finer-grained manner starting at the selected item***, as recited in independent claim 1. Rather, as presented above, Card et al. displays a virtual page separate from a representation of a virtual three-dimensional book, in addition to preserving a logical ordering in the electronic representation of the virtual book.

With respect to the secondary reference, Johnson et al. relates to “[a] media browsing system prepares various media content and synchronizes the content with a media player for playback.” (Abstract; Johnson et al.) In particular the secondary reference discloses (§[0009]): “systems and methods provide for acquiring commonly accessed information and presenting such information in a preconfigured format through a user interface that is common across various media players” Yet, Johnson et al. fails to disclose the limitation of [...] ***selection of the***

*item changes the order of the collection and moves the selected item to the front of the collection* allowing the user to navigate the rest of the collection in a finer-grained manner starting at the selected item, as recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, the secondary reference fails to remedy the aforementioned deficiencies of Card et al.

Fredlund et al. is directed to “system for creating lenticular motion cards from digital image files captured by a camera. More particularly, the invention is directed to a system for previewing and selecting digital images captured by a digital camera or by a hybrid film/digital camera.” (See ¶[0001]; Fredlund et al.) In addition, Fredlund et al. discloses (¶[0009]): “[...] a display for displaying a motion sequence of captured images, a user interface for selecting a subset of the captured digital images [...]” Yet, the tertiary reference is silent regarding [...] ***selection of the item changes the order of the collection and moves the selected item to the front of the collection*** allowing the user to navigate the rest of the collection in a finer-grained manner starting at the selected item, as recited in independent claim 1.

On pages 3-4 of Office Action dated July 14, 2008, it is conceded that the combination of Card et al., Johnson et al., and Fredlund et al. fail to disclose *one or more controller inputs to control the presentation of the items, wherein a user utilizes the one or more controller inputs to navigate the collection of data items via selecting an item in the collection, **selection of the item changes the order of the collection and moves the selected item to the front of the collection** allowing the user to navigate the rest of the collection in a finer-grained manner starting at the selected item*, as recited in independent claim 1.

Raghunath relates to “mobile computing devices such as personal digital assistants (PDAs), cellular phones, pagers, and the like” (see col. 1:10-11; Raghunath). Moreover, Raghunath et al. discloses (col. 2:43-50): “an interactive user interface implementing a dynamic scroll device for enabling scrolling through text and graphics displayed via the user interface in a manner such that the amount of user manipulation of the scroller to get to a particular position in the display the user wants to get to is reduced, while retaining fine-grain control over positioning without needing excessive scroller manipulation.” Yet, Raghunath fails to disclose [...] ***selection of the item changes the order of the collection and moves the selected item to the front of the collection*** allowing the user to navigate the rest of the collection in a finer-grained manner starting at the selected item, as recited in independent claim 1. Rather, Raghunath

provides a scrolling capability to a user but does not address ordering aspects of a selection of items.

It should be appreciated that in the novel feature recited in independent claim 1, it is the selection of an item and an associated change order in a collection to which the item belongs that allows a user to navigate a rest of a collection in a ***finer-grained manner started at the selected item***. Accordingly, it is submitted that even though Raghunath discloses a dynamic scroll device that provides fine-grain control, the cited reference fails to disclose expressly or inherently the limitation of *one or more controller inputs to control the presentation of the items, wherein a user utilizes the one or more controller inputs to navigate the collection of data items via selecting an item in the collection, selection of the item changes the order of the collection and moves the selected item to the front of the collection* allowing the user to navigate the rest of the collection in a finer-grained manner starting at the selected item, as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection of independent claim 1, and associated dependent claims, is based on the assertion that it is obvious to combine references to attain a limitation and associated advantage(s) not disclosed in the references, alone or in combination.

**Claim 16.**—The subject independent claim recites: means for selecting the set of information items to find an approximate position of an item in the set of information items, wherein **selection of the item changes the order of the set and moves the selected item to the front of the set**. Card et al., Johnson et al., Fredlund et al., and Raghunath et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose expressly or inherently such novel claimed feature.

For at least the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection of independent claim 16, and associated dependent claims, is based on the assertion that it is obvious to combine references to attain a limitation and associated advantage(s) not disclosed in the references, alone or in combination.

**Claim 22 and 23.**—Independent claim 22 (from which claim 23 depends) recites: *one or more controller inputs to control the presentation of the group of pages, wherein a user utilizes the one or more controller inputs to navigate the group of pages via selecting a member page in the group, selection of the member page changes the order of the group and moves the selected member page to the front of the group* allowing the user to navigate the rest of the group in a

*finer-grained manner starting at the selected member page.* Card et al., Johnson et al., Fredlund et al., and Raghunath, alone or in combination, fail to disclose expressly or inherently such novel claimed feature.

For at least the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection of independent claim 22, and associated dependent claims, is based on the assertion that it is obvious to combine references to attain a limitation and associated advantage(s) not disclosed in the references, alone or in combination.

It should be noted that on pp. 7-8 of the Office Action dated July 14, 2008, there is not argument set forth as to why the combination of Card et al., Johnson et al., Fredlund et al., and Raghunath makes obvious the foregoing limitation recited in independent claim 22.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants' representative respectfully submits that the combination of Card et al., Johnson et al., Fredlund et al., and Raghunath, fails to make obvious the novel limitations recited in claims 1, 3-11, 13-16, 22, and 23, and respectfully request the subject claims be allowed.

## **II. Rejection of Claims 17, 18, 20, and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 17, 18, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Card et al. (US 7,069,518) in view of Fredlund et al. (US 2003/0128287) in further view of Raghunath (US 7,081,905). Applicants' representative respectfully request this rejection of the subject claims be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 17 (from which claims 18, 20, and 21 depend) recites: *employing the first control to find an approximate position of an item in the stack of display items, wherein selection of the item changes the order of the stack of display items and moves the selected item to the front of the stack.* Card et al., Fredlund et al., and Raghunath et al., alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest such novel claimed feature.

Card et al. relates to "[...] image display systems, and, in particular, user interfaces for the display and operation of large-scale informational sources, such as hypertext, three-dimensional books, databases, and other repositories of information." (See col. 1:33-37; Card et al.). In particular, Card et al. discloses (col. 5, line 60-col. 6, line 6): "[...] 'sliding-out' a virtual page only serves to display that virtual page in a different position on the computer display **separate from the visual representation of the rest of the virtual three-dimensional book.** In

this way, "sliding-out" **does not denote the removal of data associated with a virtual page from its logical order** in the electronic representation of a virtual three-dimensional book. A "slide-out" page will still appear in the electronic representation of the virtual three-dimensional book despite the fact it may appear separately from the virtual three-dimensional book on the display. (Emphasis added.)” Yet, in such passage or other portions of the cited document, Card et al. fails to disclose expressly or inherently the limitation of [...] ***selection of the item changes the order of the stack of display items and moves the selected item to the front of the stack***, as recited in independent claim 17. Rather, in Card et al. selection of a page for display retains a logical ordering in the electronic representation of the virtual book.

Fredlund et al. does not make up for the foregoing deficiency of Card et al. Fredlund et al. is directed to “system for creating lenticular motion cards from digital image files captured by a camera. More particularly, the invention is directed to a system for previewing and selecting digital images captured by a digital camera or by a hybrid film/digital camera.” (See ¶[0001]; Fredlund et al.) In addition, Fredlund et al. discloses (¶[0009]): “[...] a display for displaying a motion sequence of captured images, a user interface for selecting a subset of the captured digital images [...]” Yet, the secondary reference is silent regarding [...] ***selection of the item changes the order of the stack of display items and moves the selected item to the front of the stack***, as recited in independent claim 17.

With respect to Raghunath, this tertiary reference fails to make up for the deficiencies of Card et al. and Fredlund et al., alone or in combination. Raghunath relates to “mobile computing devices such as personal digital assistants (PDAs), cellular phones, pagers, and the like” (see col. 1:10-11; Raghunath). Moreover, Raghunath et al. discloses (col. 2:43-50): “an interactive user interface implementing a dynamic scroll device for enabling scrolling through text and graphics displayed via the user interface in a manner such that the amount of user manipulation of the scroller to get to a particular position in the display the user wants to get to is reduced, while retaining fine-grain control over positioning without needing excessive scroller manipulation.” Yet, Raghunath fails to disclose [...] ***selection of the item changes the order of the stack of display items and moves the selected item to the front of the stack***, as recited in independent claim 17. Rather, Raghunath provides a scrolling capability, i.e., a dynamic scroll device, to a user but fails to address ordering aspects of a selection of items.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection of independent claim 17, and associated dependent claims, is based on the assertion that it is obvious to combine references to attain a limitation and associated advantage(s) not disclosed in such references, alone or in combination.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants' representative respectfully submits that the combination of Card et al., Fredlund et al., and Raghunath, fails to make obvious the novel limitations recited in claims 17, 18, 20, and 21, and respectfully request the subject claims be allowed.

### **CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP544US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731